

Application: 10/604,360 (Spero) Art Unit 2875 Amendment C & Remarks page 17

Appendix to Amendment C
Listing of marked-up Changes

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 18 2006

July 17, 2006

Commissioner for Patents
Washington DC 20231

5

Sir:

Pursuant to Rule 121, the following is a copy of the amended paragraphs with deletions bracketed and additions underlined:

Abstract of Disclosure

A method and apparatus is provided for a multiple light-source illuminating device, 10
the design and construction of which is derived from the lighting requirements of a
specific lighting application. The resulting illuminating device (16) provides
illumination according to the principles of lighting practice for the optimal
performance of visual tasks. Coupling with sensors (21) and logical control (20)
allows illumination intensity and spectrum to be varied according to changing user 15
needs. The illuminating device [is comprised of] includes multiple discrete light
emitting components of different spatial intensity distribution and color spectrum
mounted in specific orientations such that the application oriented combined lighting
effect is created. The control is provided via a differentiated power supply (19)
capable of affecting the current, voltage and duty cycle determining the relative 20
contribution of each light source effecting a different spatial intensity distribution and
color spectrum.

Application: 10/604,360 (Spero) Art Unit 2875 Amendment C & Remarks page 18

Interview Summary (by Applicant)

Application/CN: 10/604,360

July 17th, 2006

Application Filed: 14 July 2003

Applicant: Spero, Yechezkal Evan

Title: Multiple Light-Source Illuminating System

Examiner: Bao Q. Truong

Art Unit: 2875

5

Participants:

(1) Applicant: Yechezkal Evan Spero (2) Supervisory Patent Examiner: Sandra O'Shea(3) Examiner: Bao Q. Truong Date of Telephonic Interview: 28th June 2006:

(A) a brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted; A note titled "Notes for Assistance in Claim Writing" (mis-numbered as application 10/604203) was sent for the interview in order to explain the physical equations behind the invention and their use and consequences in the multiple light source illuminating apparatus.

10

(B) identification of the claims discussed; We did not get as far as discussing the present claims in detail as the discussion first focused on the understanding of the invention in order for the pro se applicant to get the assistance in claim writing per M.P.E.P. § 2173.02 and §707.07(j)

15

(C) identification of specific prior art discussed; The differences of the present inventions vs. Amerson US 6,379,022 were discussed in detail. Amerson had been used in 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103 claim rejections. The Supervisor agreed that the Amerson device is not prior art to the present application.

20

(D) identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary form completed by the examiner; Figure numbering amendments were proposed by the supervisor in light of the fact that prior art and present art share the same Arabic numeral and are differentiated only by sub letters. Fig 6 requires differentiation into sub-letters.

25

(E) the general thrust of the principal arguments of the applicant and the examiner should also be identified....; The general concept of the invention was discussed in order to show the novelty of the invention and its unexpected results in relation to the prior art. The "Notes for Assistance in Claim Writing" showed how the individual light sources are arranged on the luminaire structure based on calculations of required illuminance within the living space to be illuminated. A varying number of light sources such as individual LEDs of narrow light distribution are aimed at specific areas of the living space. More LED's are concentrated at certain distant aimings and less are aimed at closer distances as shown in Fig. 2B in order to obtain the recommended illuminance levels in the living space; for example uniform illumination even into the far corners of a square room. The Supervisor's response was that although no better understanding the invention she would not write a claim based on different aimings of the LEDs since she felt she had seen such devices in other patent applications that had passed through the unit.

30

35

Application: 10/604,360 (Spero) Art Unit 2875 Amendment C & Remarks page 19

(F) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed; The Supervisor ended by suggesting that other aspects of the patent be pursued in Classes other than 362 such as 703 or 706 under method of using or use by lighting designers.

(G) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview; The applicant did succeed in explaining the difference between his invention and the prior art but did not get assistance in the construction of a patentable claim.

5

(H) in the case of an interview via electronic mail, a paper copy of the Internet e-mail contents MUST be made and placed in the patent application file as required by the Federal Records Act in the same manner as an Examiner Interview Summary Form, PTOL 413, is entered. PAIR already shows a copy of the "Notes" in the "File Wrapper"

10

Inventor's signature: Evan Spero

Certificate of Facsimile Transmission:

15

I certify that on the date below I will fax this communication to Group 2675 of the Patent Office at the following number:

Fax: (571) 273-8300

Date : July 17, 2006

Inventor's signature: y Evan Spero

20